



Fw: Item 15

Board of Supervisors to: Vicki Shelby, Cherie McKee, Hannah Miller, Jennifer Caffee, Elizabeth Ruth, Jocelyn Brennan, cr_board_clerk Clerk
Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

02/10/2014 03:13 PM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 03:13 PM -----

From: "Susan Harvey" <susan@ifsusan.com>
To: <BoardOfSups@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 02/10/2014 03:07 PM
Subject: Item 15

Hi Cytasha – Please distribute our attached comments. Thank you. Susan Harvey, North County Watch

Susan A. Harvey

"We can either have democracy in this country or
we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few.
But we can't have both."

*Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis
1856-1941*



NCW BOS Item 15 Paso water district legislation.pdf



North County Watch

Looking Out Today For Tomorrow

February 11, 2014

Board of Supervisors
"Board of Supervisors" <BoardOfSups@co.slo.ca.us>
County of San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Subject: Item 15 – Legislative Platform for the Paso Robles Groundwater District

Dear Chairman Gibson and Supervisors:

We feel there is an unwarranted rush to establish legislation governing a proposed water district for the Paso Robles groundwater basin. In addition to issues we have already raised with you, we are very concerned that the implications of the tax levying powers of a district have not been fully considered by the public or your Board. If a residential landowner or ag land owner can't pay the fees that might be assessed for the costs of running the district or for water projects, those costs become a tax lien. Can that tax lien lead to the landowner losing the land? There is no real data available as yet as to how much it will cost to run a district or how much supplemental projects might cost. You have authorized contracts to get that information and your board and the public need to know that information before the public can make an informed decision about a water district.

There has been a lot of discussion and promises from the groups proposing a California Water District that the district will not have the power to export water. The proponents point to their LAFCO petition which states the district will not export water. However, does the discretion of the LAFCO commission in defining the powers of a district include overriding state water code, specifically Section 35425: If its board deems it to be for the best interests of the district, a district may enter into a contract for the lease, sale, or use of any surplus water not then necessary for use within the district, for use either within or without the district?

Thank you for your effort to address these concerns.

Susan Harvey
President

Page 1 of 1

North County Watch

Item #15 2/11/2014
Presented by: S. Harvey
Posted to web: 2/11/2014
Page 2 of 2



Fw: Proposed Water District

Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

02/10/2014 09:45 AM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 09:45 AM -----

From: Daniella Sapriel <info@hummingbirdhouse.org>
To: Bruce Gibson <bgibson@wildblue.net>, fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us, darnold@co.slo.ca.us, ahill@co.slo.ca.us
Cc: BOARDOSUPS@CO.SLO.CA.US
Date: 02/09/2014 10:24 AM
Subject: Proposed Water District

Please provide a copy of the attached letter and both charts to each member of the Board and their LA's, and include in the public record for February 11. Thank you.



Impact Chart final.pdf



Non-Acreage pdf.pdf



11.pdf

Analysis of Proposed PROWE/PRAAGS Water District Impact

Plan: 9 Directors, 3 elected “one person one vote” of all residents in the District, plus 6 elected by acreage, 2 from each landowning category, as shown in the table below.

Votes for the 6 “category” Directors are based on acreage. Landowners are only allowed to VOTE for Directors in their land category, although the elected Director does NOT need to be from the category he or she chooses to represent. (In other words, someone who qualifies to run for Director can choose to run to represent ANY category.)

Voting Categories	Acreage Ranges	# of Landowners	% of Landowners	# of Acres	% of Acres	Highest % of acreage in this category owned by single landowner
Small	>0 and <40	4,224	86%	32,316	11%	0.12%
Medium	40 to <400	592	12%	69,442	24%	0.56%
Large	400 and above	90	2%	188,969	65%	16.15%
		4,906		290,727		

In the “Small” category (0 to < 40 acres), it takes 8 landowners who each own 5 acres to counter the vote of one landowner who owns 40 acres.

In the “Medium” category (40 to <400 acres) it takes 10 landowners who each own 40 acres to counter the vote of one landowner who owns 400 acres.

In the “Large” category (400 and above) it would take, for example, 10 landowners who each own 400 acres to counter the vote of one landowner who owns 4000 acres. Or, 4 landowners who each own 400 acres to counter the vote of one landowner who owns 1600 acres. And so forth.

Analysis of Proposed PROWE/PRAAGS Water District Impact

As shown below, the “Large Landowning” category (400 acres and above) owns 188,969 acres, or 65% of the acreage in the Basin but includes only 90 persons, or 2 percent of the landowners.

The “Large Landowning” category (90 persons) alone contains enough acreage to support a yes/no vote on District formation, as well as to “outvote” both other landowning categories combined on any acreage- or benefit-weighted issue that the District will have to “manage”, such as bringing in supplemental water, pipelines, storage, water purchases, or the like. (See Comparison Chart included as separate document.)

The “Medium Landowning” category (40 to 399 acres) contains 592 landowners, with 69,442 acres, or 24% of the acreage in the Basin.

The “Small Landowning” category (0 to 39 acres) comprises 4,224 landowners, or 86 percent of the landowning population, yet owns only 11 percent of the land, or 32,316 acres.

Adding the Medium and Small Categories together results in 4816 persons own 101,758 acres combined, or 35%

In other words, the Large Category alone has enough acreage to defeat anything the other two categories combined might vote for. Even if the Medium Category Landowners vote with the Small Landowners, together they only own 35% of the acreage.

On the other hand, adding the Large and Medium Categories together results in 682 people own 258,411 acres, or 89 percent of the acreage in the Basin, which doesn’t change the number of acreage needed for a majority, which is still achievable with the Large Landowning Category alone.

COMPARISON OF ACREAGE- OR BENEFIT-WEIGHTED VOTES VERSUS NON-WEIGHTED VOTES

ACREAGE- OR BENEFIT- WEIGHTED VOTES

DISTRICT FORMATION

(Yes/No, based on acreage) The majority of the acreage that votes must approve.

INITIAL FUNDING VOTE

(weighted on assessment per Prop 218, with irrigated ag paying the bulk of the District's operating costs).

**ELECTION OF 6 LANDOWNING DIRECTORS
IN 3 "ACREAGE CATEGORIES"** (0-39, 40-399, 400 plus)

**ANY DISTRICT PROJECT THAT REQUIRES FUNDING,
SUCH AS SUPPLEMENTAL WATER, PIPELINES,
STORAGE, PURCHASE OF NEW WATER, BANKING,
FLOOD RETENTION, ETC.**

(Requires Prop 218 vote. Those who "benefit" from the proposed project will pay the most, and get the most "votes" .) If only a portion of the District "benefits" then only landowners within that "zone of benefit" pay.

**ANYTHING THAT REQUIRES ANY LANDOWNER TO
BE ASSESSED A FEE OR CHARGE WILL BE
ACREAGE-WEIGHTED (Prop 218).**

PETITION TO LAFCO TO PROCEED

(acreage weighted, though for a petition to begin the process, and not an actual "vote")

NON-WEIGHTED VOTES

ELECTION OF 3 DIRECTORS

(one vote per registered voter who lives within Basin)

**ANY ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE DISTRICT BOARD ON
DEMAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES THAT DO NOT
REQUIRE FUNDING, SUCH AS CONSERVATION
EDUCATION OR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS,
LIMITING WATER EXTRACTION, REQUIRING,
METERING, MONITORING, REPORTING AND THE SO-
CALLED AB 3030 ENHANCEMENTS**

(These issues are not voted on by landowners. Instead, each Director has one vote, as is done at the Board of Supervisors or other governing bodies, with each Director casting a vote according to their conscience or allegiance to what they perceive as their "constituents")



Coalition of Rural Residents and Landowners

for Equity, Integrity, and Non-Partisan Leadership

February 9, 2014

To Chairman Gibson and Supervisors Hill, Mecham, Ray and Arnold

Re: PRAAGS/PROWE Special Water District

The Coalition of Rural Residents and Landowners (CORRAL) includes residents and landowners whose properties and livelihoods are dependent on water from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin and other dwindling water sources. Our ownership of (or residency on) an affected property gives us a vested interest, and makes us stakeholders, in any decisions impacting water supply and water use by any property overlying the Basin or drawing from a common water source.

We oppose the proposed PRAAGS/PROWE Special Water District on the grounds that it cedes control of all significant basin management decisions to a small fraction (90 people) of the more than 4000 basin landowners, and that details of the proposal and analyses of the impact of the proposed voting structure are not yet readily understood by the public.

A manufactured rush to meet this year's legislative deadline is not an appropriate reason for enshrining a flawed proposal into legislation that once adopted will be virtually impossible to overturn. All rural residents and affected landowners need to have an opportunity to adequately analyze the available data, and also have full and adequate disclosure of the financing sources upon which the District may depend, before being asked to vote on such a critical matter.

The Interim Urgency Ordinance was passed for 45 days in August 2013 and ratified for the full two years in October 2013 to allow the Board to thoroughly consider meaningful long-term solutions to Basin management. Rushing to get this proposal off the Board's agenda and into the Legislative process suggests political expediency rather than thoughtful consideration.

The full ramifications of the proposal are not yet understood, nor has there been adequate disclosure of the financial backers of the proposal. Until these issues are clarified, rural residents and landowners will not have the information they need to make an informed choice prior to being asked to vote on the Special District. There is no valid reason for this rush to legislate.

Daniella Sapriel, Esq.

Spokesperson

Coalition of Rural Residents and Landowners



Fw: BofS Agenda 2-11-14 / Paso Robles Groundwater Basin

Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder

02/10/2014 04:36 PM

Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

Debbie Arnold

Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:36 PM -----

From: David Broadwater <csi@thegrid.net>
To: fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, bgibson@co.slo.ca.us, ahill@co.slo.ca.us, darnold@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us
Cc: cr_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us, boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/07/2014 07:53 PM
Subject: BofS Agenda 2-11-14 / Paso Robles Groundwater Basin

SLO Co. Board of Supervisors;

re: 2-11-14 Agenda Item #15 - Legislative Platform re: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin

specif: Water District Governance Structure

I last wrote you on 8-3-13 about your 8-6-13 decision on the Urgency Ordinance, advocating an American, democratic one-person/one-vote system for any body governing the Basin. These comments reiterate that advocacy.

The PRAAGS/PROWE proposal reduces individual property owners to second-class citizens, assigning a minority of seats on a water district board to one-person/one-vote voters, and assigning the majority to voters based on the number of acres they own. It must be wholly rejected as an affront to the principles we Americans hold dear.

Before endorsing any form of governance structure for the Basin/District, the BofS must direct two efforts to acquire the requisite information:

1. An independent and comprehensive comparative analysis of governing bodies, including person/vote and acre/vote systems, as to their relative effectiveness in natural resource management and public participation.
2. Subject any proposed governance structure to the will of residents/voters in the proposed district boundaries, through direct notification of all those residents and voters, providing information about the proposal and opportunities to comment on it. Such subjection could also include a referendum/initiative on the matter.

Alternatively, if you're willing to entertain the temptation to apportion the value of the peoples' voice according to the amount of land certain classes own, here are a few ideas:

Each landowner gets 1 vote.

Non-resident landowners get 1/2 vote.
Residents owning 400+ acres get 5/8 vote.
Residents owning 40-400 acres get 3/4 vote.
Residents owning <40 acres get 7/8 vote.
Corporations get 0 vote.

Absurd?

Is not what's being proposed by vested interests also absurd?

Take a stand now for real representative government. Oppose any oligarchic regime relegating citizens to serfdom in a feudal dystopia.

I have written you a number of times on this matter, and have yet to receive a definitive reply. I await your demonstration of commitment to our fundamental principles.

David Broadwater

Atascadero



Fw: groundwater basin

Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder

Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

02/10/2014 04:36 PM

Debbie Arnold

Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:36 PM -----

From: larry carlson <lcarlson@wildblue.net>
To: fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, darnold@co.slo.ca.us, ahill@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us,
bgibson@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/09/2014 08:14 PM
Subject: groundwater basin

Dear Supervisors, Please consider all users of the groundwater when making your decisions. Everyone needs to compromise and reduce current usage. To continue to allow the biggest users of the ground water to make these decisions is not equitable to the small land owners.

Thank you for your consideration, Larry and Vicki Carlson



Fw: Water district...my 2 cents

Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

02/10/2014 04:38 PM

Debbie Arnold

Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:38 PM -----

From: steve@casswines.com
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us
Cc: "Frank Mecham" <frank.mecham@yahoo.com>
Date: 02/10/2014 09:21 AM
Subject: Water district...my 2 cents

Hi Debbie & Frank

I understand there are a couple Board mtgs this month to gather comment on the water district plan. I won't be able to attend but want to voice my support for the combined PRAAG/PWE plan.

Like you, I am not in support of more government in general (especially the APCD), but would make an exception in this case.

My day job before the wine business was at Charles Schwab, and at the end I was developing systems for our internet interface...

The one thing I took away from that experience, is that if you want to get something difficult accomplished ..you need the most motivated people in charge. A local board voted in by local people will have more motivation than any county level organization or (god forbid) state level org.

Under the current plan, I would be considered a mid size landowner, and as such, I am willing to pay my portion of what ever infrastructure plan wins support.

No matter what you decide, I'll still support you from my bully pulp[it in the tasting room !

Steve Cass



Fw: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District
Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

02/10/2014 09:46 AM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 09:45 AM -----

From: BRLHORSES@aol.com
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us, fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us, bgibson@wildblue.net, ahill@co.slo.ca.us, BOARDOSUPS@CO.SLO.CA.US
Date: 02/09/2014 10:47 AM
Subject: Fwd: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District

Subj: Fwd: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District

Since we cannot attend meeting due to we work, I want to express our concerns as well as what was forwarded to us below in email.
Everything depends on water. We do not need wine to survive. These large vineyards need to have restrictions on water usage.

Lynn Currell
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

To:
Subject: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District

The Board of Supervisors will take up the PRAAGS/PROWE proposed Water District at 1:30 pm on Tuesday Feb/ 11, 2014.

Please attend this critical meeting and make your voice heard. The proposed Water District is unfair to rural residents and ill-conceived. If adopted, it would allow the largest ag owners to control the Basin far into the future. Once special legislation is enacted, it is almost impossible to change.

Please write the Supervisors and tell them that any Water District proposed must be fair to all the residents and landowners who depend on the Basin. We need a fair and equitable management structure, and it is better to take the time to do it right than to move hastily to push this legislation forward before everyone affected has the time to analyze the impact the District would have if enacted as proposed.

Please attend. Your voice only matters if it's heard.

=



Fw: Consultant work - costs of new district for Paso Basin

Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

02/10/2014 04:36 PM

Debbie Arnold
Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:35 PM -----

From: Maria Lorca <maria7551@charter.net>
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/08/2014 06:58 AM
Subject: Consultant work - costs of new district for Paso Basin

Debbie,

Please look at the three suggestions in green below.

I am sending this to you because I think we need to know the cost of creating an entire new structure compared to the cost of keeping the district management we already have.

I hope you can ask for this comparison on Tuesday. Would have much more weight coming from you in a public meeting.

Thank you,

Maria

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maria Lorca <Maria7551@charter.net>
Subject: Re: Paso Robles Water District - Comparabel Agency Selection Criteria and Infomation Gathering
Date: February 8, 2014 6:37:30 AM PST
To: Paso BasinCommittee <pasobasincommittee@gmail.com>
Cc: Anthony Kalvans <ar.kalvans@gmail.com>, Christopher Alakel <calakel@prcity.com>, Claudia Engel <claudia@thunderheadranch.com>, Courtney Howard <choward@co.slo.ca.us>, Dana Merrill <dmerrill@mesavineyard.com>, David Athey <dathey@atascadero.org>, Dean Benedix <dbenedix@co.slo.ca.us>, Don Brady <dbrady@roberthallwinery.com>, Jaime Hendrickson <jhendrickson@amwc.us>, Jay Short <utilities@templetoncsd.org>, Jennifer Porter <jporter@pasowine.com>, Jerry Reaugh <jerry@reaughj.com>, Jim Magill <jackiemagill@sbcglobal.net>, John DeRosier <johnd@withthegrain.org>, John Neil <jneil@amwc.us>, John Wallace <johnw@wallacegroup.us>, Joy Fitzhugh <fitzhughhillranch1@gmail.com>, Keith Larson <klarson@prcity.com>, Kent Gilmore <k.gilmore7@sbcglobal.net>, Kris Beal <kris@vineyardteam.org>, Kurt Bollinger <millerdrilling@sbcglobal.net>, Larry Werner <lwernergwbsc@gmail.com>, Laura Edwards <laura@us-ltrcd.org>, Mike Cussen <mjc5677@yahoo.com>, Patricia Wilmore <pwilmore@pasowine.com>, Ray Allen <rayandmike@gmail.com>, Robert Johnson <johnsonr@co.monterey.ca.us>, Russ Thompson <rthompson@atascadero.org>, Steve Sinton <sjsinton@earthlink.net>, Sue

Luft <aslufft@wildblue.net>, Tina Mayer <tlm@templetoncsd.org>, Willy Cunha <willycunha@sunviewvineyards.com>, jbriltz@templetoncsd.org

I have three suggestions:

- 1) Include a cost comparison between creation of a new stand-alone district and an expansion of the current county district.
- 2) Add to the district budget funds for AGP Video coverage of meetings
- 3) Add to the district budget reserve funds for litigation - Pajaro District would be a source for estimated costs

Maria Lorca
At-Large Alternate
Paso Basin Committee

On Feb 2, 2014, at 2:04 PM, Paso BasinCommittee wrote:

Hi all,
Please review the attached email string.
The County is coordinating a consultant to give us valuable input on the future structure of a management district, comparing structure, staffing, costs etc.
If you have any comments please provide by 2/7 so we can proceed with a scope of work that is consistent with our expectations. I have highlighted in red the text you should review.
Please reply to this email with your comments.
Thank you,
Larry

-----Original Message-----

From: pogren@co.slo.ca.us [mailto:pogren@co.slo.ca.us]
Sent: Saturday, February 01, 2014 4:01 PM
To: Larry Werner; choward@co.slo.ca.us; dbenedix@co.slo.ca.us; wclemens@co.slo.ca.us; Sue Luft; Jerry Reaugh
Subject: Fw: Paso Robles Water District - Comparabel Agency Selection Criteria and Infromation Gathering

Larry

The following are emails that I have received from Laura Brown with Hydrometrics who will be doing some comparative analysis for us on budgets for a select number of groundwater management agencies. She has listed both criteria and agencies. I am thinking that it may be best for you to circulate to your committee members for individual comments and other feedback. I would like any such comments/feedback by the end of the week (2/7) so that Laura can have her work in draft form by the end of March. As is, I think it looks good.

Paavo Ogren
Director of Public Works

pogren@co.slo.ca.us

[805-781-5291](tel:805-781-5291) (w)

[805-781-1229](tel:805-781-1229) (fax)

----- Forwarded by Paavo Ogren/PubWorks/COSLO on 02/01/2014 03:55 PM

From: laura@hydrometricswri.com

To: pogren@co.slo.ca.us

Date: 01/30/2014 11:20 AM

Subject: Re: Paso Robles Water District - Comparabel Agency Selection
Criteria and Infromation Gathering

Hi Paavo,

As we discussed, the following criteria will be used to select comparable groundwater management agencies to use as guidelines for the new Paso Robles water district:

1. Groundwater pumping includes a mix of users including agriculture, M&I and rural residential. At least 50% of basin extraction should be for agriculture.
2. The agency should perform the following functions:
 - a. Collects and manages pumping data
 - b. Monitors groundwater levels and quality
 - c. Performs groundwater studies to understand aquifer characteristics and sustainable yield
 - d. Establishes and administers water demand management/conservation programs
 - e. Develops supplemental water supply sources and distribution systems
 - f. Assesses fees and charges to support the agency's programs and projects

We will also obtain information from each of the selected agencies about the volume of groundwater pumping and the number of irrigated acres within the groundwater management area and whether the agency is the sole entity managing the basin or if there is coordination and shared governance (e.g. a joint powers agency) with other agencies. If groundwater management functions are performed by multiple agencies within a single basin, we will identify what each agency is doing and the cost.

Once you have approved the list of comparable agencies, we will contact each of them to: 1) obtain a current operating budget; 2) understand the fee structure for acquiring operating revenues and whether capital improvement project costs are proportioned according to benefit; 3) identify staffing classifications and numbers

and associated salaries and benefits (including whether the agency is a PERS member); 4) identify ongoing consultant costs and services, e.g. hydrogeologists, legal and engineering services; and 5) understand how pumping quantities are determined for purposes of rates, i.e. are all wells metered or only large wells with flat rates assigned to smaller wells based on water use factors.

Please let me know if there are any revisions to any of the criteria or information gathering listed above.

Laura D. Brown
Senior Manager
HydroMetrics WRI

n Thu, 30 Jan 2014 07:08:01 -0800, pogren@co.slo.ca.us wrote:
Hi Laura

>
> Thanks for the email; please remind me of the criteria that we
> discussed yesterday and I will forward to our Committee Chair.
>
> Paavo Ogren
> Director of Public Works
> pogren@co.slo.ca.us
> [805-781-5291](tel:805-781-5291) (w)
> [805-781-1229](tel:805-781-1229) (fax)
>
>
>
> From: laura@hydrometricswri.com
> To: pogren@co.slo.ca.us
> Date: 01/29/2014 11:51 AM
> Subject: Paso Robles Water District - List of Potential Comparable
> Agencies
>
>
>
>
>
> Hi Paavo,
>
> Following is a preliminary list of California water agencies that
may have
> comparable roles and functions to those envisioned for the new Paso
Robles
> water district. The idea is to vet the list to select the five that
> most closely match the Paso Robles concept and then obtain information

> from
them
> that can help guide Paso Robles' budget decisions, etc. Please let me
know
> if there are other agencies I should add to this list or if any of
> those listed are inappropriate.
>
> Desert Water Agency
> Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency Honey Lake Groundwater
> Management District Kern County Water Agency Long Valley Groundwater
> Management District Mendocino City Community Services District Mono
> County Tri-Valley Groundwater Management District Ojai Groundwater
> Management Agency Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency Semitropic
> Water Storage District Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
> Willow Creek Groundwater Management Agency
>
> Thanks so much. I look forward to getting underway with this research.
>
> Laura D. Brown
> Senior Manager
> HydroMetrics WRI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> [Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]
>
>
>

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]



Fw: Legislative Platform Policy Statement Item #15

Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder,
BOS_Legislative Assistants

02/10/2014 03:11 PM

Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 03:11 PM -----

From: Carole Hansen <signysgram@gmail.com>
To: BoardofSuprs@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/10/2014 11:42 AM
Subject: Legislative Platform Policy Statement Item #15

Dear Supervisors:

Since I will be unable to attend tomorrow's meeting, I'm writing as a concerned citizen and resident of Paso Robles. I urge you to add special legislation regarding the formation of a water district to your BoS legislative platform. There can be no doubt that the water situation in SLO County, as well as in the entire state, is critical.

Please listen to the voices of your constituents and consider taking positive action that will be in the best interest of all concerned.

Please also enter this letter into the record for tomorrow's hearing, Feb.11 2014.

Thank you,

Carole Hansen



Fw: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin

Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder, Adam Hill, Bruce Gibson, Caren Ray, Cherie McKee, Debbie Arnold, Elizabeth Ruth,
Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

02/10/2014 09:50 AM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 09:49 AM -----

From: Mike Dimond <createabang@gmail.com>
To: BoardofSuprs@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/10/2014 09:19 AM
Subject: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin

re: BoS hearing: Legislative Platform Policy Statement, February 11, Item # 15

I support the formation of a water district for the Paso Robles groundwater basin as proposed by PRO Water Equity and PRAAGS.

Please enter my letter into the record for this hearing.

Thank you,
Mike Dimond



Fw: Supervisor Arnold, I oppose the PRAAGS-PWE Proposal

Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder

02/10/2014 04:35 PM

Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

Debbie Arnold

Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:35 PM -----

From: larry <larry@mcgourty.com>
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/09/2014 10:52 AM
Subject: Supervisor Arnold, I oppose the PRAAGS-PWE Proposal

I oppose any legislation to create a Water Management District in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. Only adjudication will protect the property rights of ALL landowners -regardless of parcel size. This may not be a popular position with your colleagues, but if you stand-up for us now, I will support you any way I can in the future.



Fw: Water District

Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder

Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

02/10/2014 09:44 AM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 09:44 AM -----

From: John Bergen <jayridleyb@gmail.com>
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us, fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, ahill@co.slo.ca.us, bgibson@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us, ccampa@co.slo.ca.us, Board of Sups@co.slo.ca.us
Cc: Sue Luft <aslufft@wildblue.net>
Date: 02/08/2014 11:38 AM
Subject: Water District

Dear Supervisors:

As small homeowners on a 9-acre site who have recently been forced to replace our well, we strongly support Pro Water Equity's efforts to establish a focused, responsive, and professionally managed Water District.

We urge you to take action on this key issue as soon as possible.

John and Hannah Bergen



Fw: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District

Board of Supervisors to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder,
BOS_Legislative Assistants

02/10/2014 03:10 PM

Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 03:10 PM -----

From: Doug Kuentzel <dkuentze@calpoly.edu>
To: <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, <fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>,
<cray@co.slo.ca.us>, <ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, <BOARDOSUPS@CO.SLO.CA.US>
Date: 02/10/2014 11:17 AM
Subject: FW: Board Meeting Tuesday re Water District

It is my position that the voters / controllers of this issue is and should be everyone who is a registered voter on this land area. If you are an absentee owner, you do not have a vote. Perhaps a district that is only made up of large landowners engaged in a common pursuit is an appropriate governing approach for management. That is not what this resource reflects, but a very diverse and historically established collection of users. Irrigation of Dry Lands historically used for grazing land and grain farming is a new and ill-advised action.

- 1.) When Supervisor Arnold lamented during the "vesting" discussion, she said' "How could they (growers) have seen this coming?" That is easy. Before investing in any enterprise, a business person engages what is commonly referred to as Due Diligence. Assets, necessary resources and production viability are verified prior to investing. The program of the vintners of turning the entire surface area of this basin into irrigated lands is not now and was never a viable. That was a gamble at best by both large and small
- 2.) Therefore, if a proper planning was not done by large and small growers, that is simply a poor business decision. It is not the responsibility of anyone else to assume that burden. There is no legislative action that can or should fix that any more that you can make the public support a bad restaurant. The special interest for the proposed District structure attempts to create a reality to control resources that do not exist. It is still a bad business decision and the aquifer will be just as empty with this District. It is not the Board's function to try to make good anyone's business plan.
- 3.) Any district formed here is to have as its primary goal to preserve and restore the aquifer. The goal of governance is not to cover bad decision by a short sighted program based on the exploitation of this or any other resource.

Do not allow this exclusive District to proceed. We are the district as resident voters and must be the stewards of the aquifer. Emphasize endorsement of the Feb 9 letter prepared by the Coalition of Rural Residents and Landowners.

Doug Kuentzel



Fw: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN .
Debbie Arnold to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

02/10/2014 04:35 PM

Debbie Arnold
Supervisor, 5th District
San Luis Obispo County
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/10/2014 04:35 PM -----

From: Richard Sauret <sauretvines@gmail.com>
To: darnold@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 02/09/2014 09:08 AM
Subject: Fwd: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Sauret** <sauretvines@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 9:06 AM
Subject: Fwd: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN.
To: fmecham@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Sauret** <sauretvines@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 9:04 AM
Subject: Fwd: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN.
To: katchoman@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Sauret** <sauretvines@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Feb 8, 2014 at 9:38 AM
Subject: Fwd: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN.
To: cashymalibu@aol.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Sauret** <sauretvines@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Feb 8, 2014 at 9:26 AM

Subject: Paso Robles GROUND WATER BASIN.

To: "usaindustries@pacbell.net" <usaindustries@pacbell.net>

The Paso Robles ground water basin has formed three organizations that will do nothing more than turn this problem into a political fiasco and cost many a lot of money and will not have a positive effect toward the dying basin. A common sense approach needs to be used to deal with this problem, the decision starting twenty years ago and has already been made by those pumping from that basin, everyone has to use a lot less water.

The city of Paso Robles gets most if not all its water from that basin and must be included in all actions towards the resolution to the problem, if they are not when the water levels get lower and the quality gets worse than they are now they will for sure blame the vineyards and winery's for its death and at the present pace of usage the basin will die.

There is considerable amount of land included in the basin that doesn't have a water problem and had nothing to do with its problem and should be excluded, it is only a land grab to get more acres to build a revenue base to pay for their efforts that I believe will go no where.

I have been growing wine grapes in the Paso Robles area since 1952 and in most years with average rainfall had no irrigation at all, on a deficit rainfall year some supplemental irrigation is necessary, last year was one of those years when I had 5.5 inches, I used .18 acre feet of water per acre. (600 vines per acre) It was good quantity and quality. Quantity probably less than most growers would expect but for me sustainable under the conditions.

A formula to stabilize the basin is one that most won't agree with but will work if all vineyards co-operate. Based on 750 vines per acre each vine would get 326 gallons per season or .75 acre feet per acre, if you have 1500 vines per acre they each get 163 gallons per vine but still .75 acre feet per acre. kwh can be used to determine gallons pumped from a well. 28000 acres vineyards in the appellation times .75 acre feet equals 21000 acre feet total. Some things will change but it can be done, I done it with a lot less. High density plantings is a huge downfall under present conditions.

A 25000 case winery will use approx 200,000 gallons of water, 50,000 of that for flowers trees etc, that would be .61 acre feet per year.

If in fact the basin has a recharge factor of 88'000 acre feet per year there would be a considerable amount for other users.

With the co-operation of all water users to live and let live and keep the Paso Robles area a happy healthy place to live would be an awesome accomplishment

but at this point we have no other choice.

IGGPRA President Emeritus

Richard Sauret